India

FOR THE

No. 75. New Series.
No. 169. Old Series.

WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, JUNE 9, 1899.

Registered as a Newspaper. Price...... 2d By Post, 2½d.

Notes and News 277
The Desecration of the Tomb 278
The Bombay Government and Higher Education.—II., by the Hon. C. H. Setalvad 280
Our London Letter 282
Chronicle of the Week 283
Letter to the Editor: Vilification of Indian Character 284
Notes from Bombay 284
The Sugar Duty Act 285
"The Police Confessional" 286
Indian Affairs in Parliament: Special Report 286
The Rangoon Outrage: Telegram... 287
Advertisements 288

NOTES AND NEWS.

As will be seen from the letter printed on page 284, Mr. Alfred Webb, in view of the persistent vilification of Indian character in certain quarters, is "desirous of making a collection of testimonies to the contrary given by officials and other residents in India and writers about India." Mr. Webb, who, we understand, contemplates a little publication on the matter, invites the co-operation of our readers, and we have no doubt that it will be gladly accorded.

The outrage by soldiers in Burma becomes worse as we know more about it. The *Pioneer* writes:—

> A number of facts admitted by both sides go to show that this case was perhaps the worst of its kind ever recorded against British troops. The woman outraged was an elderly person; the hour was shortly after noon on Sunday; the place close to a public highway within sight of a large number of soldiers, of whom some twelve or sixteen were directly concerned.

The unfortunate woman is said to have been outraged by the soldiers in turn. She afterwards lost her reason. On Wednesday, May 10, one soldier, and apparently only one, was prosecuted at the Rangoon sessions and was acquitted. According to *Power and Guardian*,

> Europeans and Burmese alike are incensed at the termination of the trial of an apparently innocent man, while the culprits are shielded.

One is reluctant to have anything more to say to such a disgraceful business as this case of the West Kent Regiment in Burma, but the details of the trial of Horrocks are now before us in the columns of the *Rangoon Gazette* (May 9, 10, 11), and they irresistibly require remark. Horrocks was indicted on two alternative charges: (1) Of having on April 2 last outraged a Burmese woman named Ma Goon; (2) Of having attempted to commit that offence. The jurymen were all Europeans. Ma Goon's answers in cross-examination are said to have "clearly shown that she was not in her right senses." Two Burmese cartmen deposed that they saw a number of soldiers pulling an old Burmese woman from the road up a slope, heard her call for help, and saw the woman outraged. Mr. A. T. Abraham, clerk in the Secretariat, said he was taken to the spot by three soldiers whom he found standing (as sentinels?) at the end of the nullah, and saw about twenty soldiers there, and when he "protested to the three soldiers who were with him as to their conduct," he was told "that it did not concern him, and to go away." "The soldiers," he said, "were all drunk." Maung Shwe Yin, a clerk, stated that, with a dozen other Burmans, he attempted to get at the miscreants, but both these and the police were held back by soldiers, who threw stones at them. Maung Gyi "deposed to the police constable and Maung Po Da arresting the prisoner almost simultaneously with the commission of the offence." "Sunder Singh, police constable, who arrested the prisoner near the woman, gave evidence to that effect." A European corporal had come up by this time, and "was about two or three feet away from the prisoner at the time of the arrest," but when this egregious corporal came to give evidence he was in a state of dense ignorance as to everything that had been going on under his nose. The inspector at the cantonment guard, however, said the corporal, "could have no doubt as to the nature of the complaint against the prisoner." The jury were divided: six for acquittal, three for conviction. So Horrocks was acquitted.

There is a specimen of justice as administered in Burma. It is for the English public to consider the matter. We make no reflection on the magistrate or on the police officials; it is not so easy to understand the state of mind of two-thirds of the jury. Besides, the indiscipline of these soldiers is only too painfully indicated. We learn from the Allahabad correspondent of the *Times* (June 4) that General Montague Protheroe, commanding the Burma District, has instituted a searching enquiry into this disgraceful outrage. It is something to the good that the *Times* should take any notice of the occurrence at all, when one remembers how silent it was over the shocking manslaughter of Dr. Sircar at Barrackpur. The correspondent reports the feeling on the Horrocks case, thus:

> Great indignation prevails, among Anglo-Indians and Natives alike, that weeks should have passed while none of the culprits have been brought to justice. The civil authorities appear to be helpless, the soldiers refusing to give evidence, and no soldiers being positively identified. By civilians it is regarded as a scandalous reflection on *morale* and discipline that some forty men were either witnesses of or participants in the outrage, while the regimental authorities have hitherto arrested nobody. . . . I have reason to know that a feeling almost amounting to resentment prevails among the district staff at the hitherto apparent apathy of the regimental authorities.

We hope this virtuous indignation will not be allowed to run to waste. If the particular soldier, or soldiers, that outraged the poor woman cannot be identified, the thirty or forty present on the occasion can be identified; and, if General Protheroe has any grit in him, he should not be many days in getting to the bottom of the matter, or, at any rate, in taking such steps as will prevent these thirty or forty from again disgracing a British uniform.

A case which has recently come before the North-Western Provinces High Court on appeal reminds us of the difficulties that are everywhere growing up between the British soldiers and the people in India. Four soldiers went out shooting at Mochra, near Meerut. Two of them, separated from the others, killed a peacock. Then the villagers assumed a threatening attitude, and one of the soldiers shot a man, wounding him slightly. Afterwards, the other two soldiers were set upon, and one of them also used his gun with effect, a villager being killed. Both parties were put on their trial, the soldiers being acquitted and the villagers convicted. The High Court on appeal refused to order the soldiers to be retried. It is not our intention to find fault with this decision. We agree with the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* that to try again prisoners who have been acquitted is barbarous—a blot on the Indian code; but it may be allowable to point out what a series of misfortunes have sprung from the wanton or ignorant act of the soldiers in shooting the peacock. One villager was killed, two or more injured, several convicted and sentenced. In India a soldier's holiday may involve a vast amount of human suffering.

Dr. Fairbairn's paper on "Religion in India" in the current number of the *Contemporary Review* gives the first impressions of his recent tour. It is written throughout with a strong desire to be fair to India and her faiths, as the following bears witness:—

> And why, the Hindu asks himself, should he accept this Western religion? He has one of his own—ancient, potent, elastic; it embodies his instinctive genius, suits his special needs, is older than the Christian, rests on thought he has elaborated and many Western men have learned to admire. To surrender his religion would be to make a complete surrender of himself, his past, his separate mind and being, and to become a mere echo of the civilisation he despises. The Hindu reaction is thus a very real force, moved by reasons we cannot but respect.

On the other hand Dr. Fairbairn is inclined, it seems to us, to exaggerate the intolerance of the Moslem conquerors. However that may be, his review of the various religions of India, the Hindu and the Mahometan, the Jain, the Sikh and the Buddhist contains much that is of interest, and their influence on each other becomes apparent. He

has indeed the dislike of the modern European—the product of the vigorous life of the West, with its hope of human progress—for quietism and asceticism; but he forgets that in the age when Christianity was least challenged in the West these were looked on as Christian virtues, and are still so considered by large numbers who profess the Christian name. With regard to Christianity he says:—

It does not yet appear what the Christians may do. They are too young, too foreign in their inspiration and mind, to be fairly placed alongside of the better men of religions which are so ancient as to have become, even where immigrant, naturalised.

And he then goes on to attribute to Christianity the educational and social progress which has resulted from the contact of East and West. But the civilisation of the West is due not to Christianity alone, but to many forces, some Christian, some non-Christian, some even anti-Christian. He believes that Christianity "is the most potent factor as yet at work for the reconciliation of the Hindu to the English rule." We doubt whether the work of all Christian missionaries can be described as one of reconciliation. That unfortunate opponent of Christianity who recently received a sentence of eight months' imprisonment has possibly a different opinion.

Power and Guardian gives some further particulars of this case. It appears that the Hindu hawker was plying his trade near the Y.M.C.A. Some Christian preachers took up their stand opposite, and, according to the Christians, "the book-seller read out a work in which the Nativity of Jesus Christ is lampooned, and amplified on it. This shocked the religious feelings of the Christians, and to such an extent that the preaching was disturbed." They certainly dissembled their outraged feelings, since they preached for an hour and a-half as usual. The prosecution contended that preaching in the streets is worship, and that the accused wilfully disturbed the worshippers and deliberately insulted their religious feelings. As our readers know, the hawker, who seems to have been only following his usual custom of reading from his wares as an advertisement, was convicted and sentenced to the monstrous iniquity of eight months' imprisonment. Our contemporary doubts whether there is any parallel Indian case to this, and calls on the Hindus to suppress those attacks on the Hindu religion which are the stock-in-trade of the ordinary missionary.

Mr. Dattatraya M. Gupte has addressed to the *Times of India* a very able and sensible letter of criticism on a crude suggestion in Professor Gole's work on Hindu Religion and Reform. The Professor says that the theological reform movement has had its day, leaving the people free to return to their ancient faith. The vitality and tenacity of the Hindu religion has been amply proved through thirty centuries, and Mr. Gupte is no doubt perfectly right when he maintains that it still holds its ground under all the apparent disturbances on the surface. But what we regard as most important in Mr. Gupte's attitude is his recognition of the indubitable principle that the religion must go forward and not backward, and that under the influences arising and operating from time to time. The gradual break-up of the caste system will destroy much that is good with much that is evil; and Christianity is but one of the many forces with which the system has to reckon, and one that cannot be said to be represented in its best forms. The essential thing is that the natural forces be allowed to work out their natural results. No good can eventually come of any change that does not develop silently from the inner consciousness of the people under the surrounding influences that bear continuously on their daily life.

The main agent of our "great and beautiful civilising mission" to the Afridis and Mohmunds is the notorious Dum-Dum bullet. The use of this marvel of modern scientific invention is all "according to Cocker," for were the lethal missiles not "issued by order of the Government of India?" Still the humanitarian murmurs from this side appear to have reached the Government of India, which has been for some little time industriously experimenting on a substitute, which shall stop the enemy without mangling him into a useless carcase. Lord George Hamilton told Mr. Dillon (June 5) that, when he last heard—"about two months ago"—the trials "were not complete, but they would be proceeded with and reported on as soon as possible." Mr. Dillon did well to persist in asking that the new pattern bullet be not adopted until there has been laid before the House "the opinion of medical experts on the effects of that bullet on animals." The opinion of the Peace Conference against the continued use of the Dum-Dum bullet will reinforce opinion at home; and Lord George will be wise to hurry up the leisurely experiments which he says they are making in India. There is little sign of renewed warfare just at present, notwithstanding the keen edge of the military bloods at Simla. But there is no saying when bullets may be whizzing again beyond the frontier.

In an article on "Indian Loyalty" the *Pioneer* says:—

When her Majesty ascended the throne it was considered to be high policy in India to divide and rule; but now it has come to be accepted as the destiny and duty of our imperial race to unite, uplift and associate in rule the millions of aliens over whom her Majesty holds sway. This is at least a great advance, and the time is surely fitting to reflect upon its meaning, and to consider how far there can be a development in practice of this great and majestic conception of Imperial policy.

Like so much that the *Pioneer* has been saying lately, this represents a view of England's rule that commends itself to the Indians, as the true ideal to be aimed at. It was, in truth, the great justification of the Roman Empire that it "united, uplifted and associated in rule" the peoples of the West. But the British Empire still lags far behind the Roman. Gauls and Spaniards, Cretans and Illyrians could sit on the throne of Augustus, but we shall have to wait a long time before we see an Indian in the position now held by Lord Salisbury. Nay, even in their own country, the Indians are still shut out from the highest offices. The *Pioneer* is quite right. It is a fitting time to consider how there can be a development in practice of the great ideal it puts forward.

The *Pioneer* goes on to point out how much the loyalty of India is dependent on the personal influence of the officers of Government:—

Nor is it very hard to win personal influence among the impressionable peoples of India. The root of such influence is sympathy, and a desire, testified by acts, however simple or small, to help Indians when they are in trouble or anxious to better their position. The little daily courtesies of life are more endearing than high-sounding speeches or large measures of policy. The friendly greeting, the kind enquiry, timely aid and readiness to recommend or introduce to others, a shake of the hand, even a passing smile, will go much further to promote loyalty and unity than the most elaborate vindication of justice.

But the appeal which follows to celebrate her Majesty's birthday by imitating her courtesy and sympathy will, it is to be feared, fall on deaf ears. It is admitted that the estrangement between European and Indian is increasing. Our contemporary has prescribed the true medicine; but can it get its patients to take it, or will they rather go on, becoming more arrogant and more exclusive, undermining the Empire whose glory is their continued boast, and showing how much inferior they are to those Romans of old whose example they are so ready to plead as their justification?

"One of the greatest needs of modern administration in India is to place reasonable limits upon the exercise of authority," says the *Pioneer*. The contradictory decisions of the different High Courts and the disastrous plague rules in different parts of India are given as examples. As a remedy for the first it proposes that when one High Court desires to reverse the decision of another, it should refer the matter *suo motu* to the Privy Council, or to a Court in which all the High Courts are represented. For the second, the abuse of the power to issue rules, it is suggested that except in cases of emergency, before rules are issued under any Act, a draft should be published in the *Gazette* and the opinions of the public invited. Our contemporary continues:—

For of making many rules there is no end, and much study of them is a weariness of the flesh. Let no one say that these misgivings are without foundation. The deplorable domestic history of plague rules in parts of India is in itself sufficient to justify what we have written, and the bitter fruit of these rules is in itself enough to call for a consideration of the present system.

But to speak thus of plague rules would have been "sedition" not so very long ago.

The *Pioneer* welcomes the announcement that Lord Curzon hopes to "muzzle the secretariats." It goes on:—

One may laugh with his Excellency at the ponderous "manuscript"

eloquence of Indian gentleman upon Legislative Councils, but ridicule may with equal justice be directed to those past masters in the arts of repetition and circumlocution who from generation to generation have sat in the high places of Indian bureaucracy.

It is not only that all this leads to a waste of time and money, to discredit and ridicule, to an excessive culture of the critical faculty and the spirit of detail. Personal intercourse with the people becomes almost impossible. "Over-writing and over-centralisation are inseparable. . . . . By steady concentration of ideas on the working of the administrative machine one is apt to lose sight of the ends of administration, and to sacrifice what is essential to what is accidental to good government." But what a contrast is this "viewy," "critical" official, chiefly engaged in writing reports, to the popular English conception of the Indian civilian, the strong practical man, the embodiment of justice and stern decision.

When a revision of revenue assessment occurs, it is to be anticipated, as of course, that the occupiers will raise their voice in complaint. There has been a revision settlement in Gujarat, and the agriculturalists of the Olpad Taluka in the Surat Collectorate have memorialised the Collector in strong terms of deprecation. They allege that the revenue officers were aware of the natural disadvantages of their holdings, and of the unremunerative character of their industry; and that, in the face of such knowledge, they have raised the assessment in Olpad while reducing it in other districts better able to bear an increase. The new enhancement, they allege, "will drive them to despair and to relinquish their holdings." It is not possible for outsiders to pronounce on the question raised, but it seems very clear that the memorialists are entitled to enquiry into the points they allege.

A useful Return has just been issued, on the motion of Sir William Wedderburn, showing for each of the years 1882-83 to 1898-99 inclusive (1) the quantity and the value of the imports of sugar into India from Germany, Austria, and Mauritius, (2) the acreage of sugar-cane cultivation in the several Provinces of India, (3) the quantity of refined Indian sugar exported from Bengal and the North-West Provinces to other Provinces in India and to the Native States, and (4) the quantity of Indian sugar, refined and unrefined, exported to Ceylon, to the United Kingdom, and to other countries. The figures of the Return bear out our view of the case in the most marked way. In 1890-91, the import of German refined sugar rose from 40,734 cwts. to 709,195 cwts., but did not again rise much above one-third of the latter figures till 1895-96, when it sprung to 718,218. In the next two years it rose to 758,806 and 1,203,309 cwts.; but in 1898-99 (11 months) it fell back to 396,352 cwts. It is only in the last years that the Austrian import has risen. The Mauritius import is better, though not very much better, than it has been on an average of a dozen years. The values correspond roughly with the quantities. The Indian acreage in 1890-91 to 1897-98 (inclusive) has been 2,758,372; 3,100,147; 2,798,548; 2,764,573; 2,930,513; 2,651,672; 2,675,763. These figures impress emphatically the nonsense that has been talked about the frightful decline, and imminence of the land being thrown out of cultivation.

An Anglo-Indian correspondent writes:—"It is due to the *Times* as a newspaper to acknowledge that it places before the British public more matter relating to our Indian Empire than is found in any other of our dailies. It is enabled to do so by reason of the expansiveness of its broad sheet; and its willingness to do this service may fairly be attributed to the good sense of its conductors. Too often, indeed, there has been occasion to complain of the partisan and political bias shown in treatment of current Indian topics, alike in its leading columns and its telegraphic despatches; but these matters are not just now in question. What we have here to take note of is a recent glaring misrepresentation of the statistics of India's foreign trade for the financial year 1898-9, which closed with March. Before explaining the nature of the serious error or misstatement comprised in the leading journal's brief and harmless-looking statistical paragraph, it may be well, as a matter of current public interest, to set out the exact results of India's sea-borne commerce for the past year as now cast up. It may be remarked, in passing, that India's overland trade is a mere trifle. It is the official customs figures we cite, as did the *Times*, with this formal difference that we give them in tens of rupees, to avoid the puzzlement of the Indian numeration in lakhs and crores—

The year April, 1898, *to March*, 1899, *both inclusive.*

	Rx.
EXPORTS.	
Merchandise	112,722,930
Treasure	7,408,180
	120,131,110 (*a*)
IMPORTS.	
Merchandise	68,473,248
Treasure	17,883,956
	86,357,204 (*b*)

India's EXCESS of exports over imports Rx.33,773,906 (*c*)

This shows the hard fact of India's international trade as disclosed in the official returns for the year ending with March 31 last. That is, India sent out produce and other commercial values to the amount of thirty-three and three-quarter millions (Rx.) more than she received. Some few personal and private transactions may not get into the public accounts; but far the larger part of these affect and come into the above movements of merchandise or treasure (*a* and *b*). There are other adjustments required, including addition to the merchandise export figures of freight, insurance, and interest—usually estimated at ten or fifteen per cent. This, as will be seen, makes the real deficit in India's trade for the year come to about forty-five millions of 'rupee pounds.'

"Obviously this broad fact of India's loss on its commercial transactions with the outer world, during the twelve months under notice, casts a dark shade across the official and other conventional assertions as to the 'prosperity' of that Empire of ours. So the statistician of the leading journal seems to have considered it desirable to disguise the afflicting truth. This was cleverly attempted, we will not say 'with intent to deceive,' but certainly so as must have effectually misled the unsuspecting readers of the great journal. This is how it was done: There was thrust into the Import side of the account the amount paid out of the Indian treasuries for the Council Bills whereby the Home Charges are paid for, namely, Rx. 28,105,367, thus reducing the real deficiency (our line *c*) to Rs.5,668,599! Worse still, this was described in the conventional money-market phrase as 'Balance in favour of India.' Then to further minify the facts and mystify the 'Constant Reader' of the *Times*, this five millions and more was reduced at '1s. 4d. per rupee' into £3,779,065.

"Now it is scarcely needful to explain to 'the meanest capacity' that to include as Imports the twenty-eight millions *paid out*, which are already included in the total of Exports (our line *a*) is, in effect, a monstrous perversion of the facts of India's international commercial balance sheet. It would be just as reasonable to have added to the merchandise imports the sum of the invoices in which these transactions were recorded. How is it to be expected that the busy British public can understand the true position of India's trade finance when devices of this sort are resorted to by our leading journal?"

Our hearty congratulations to Prince Ranjitsinhji upon the brilliant innings which, at Nottingham on Saturday, saved England from defeat at the hands of Australia. The special correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* wrote:—

For England Ranjitsinhji played an innings which will live in cricket history. He excelled even himself. For two hours and fifty minutes he was grimly fighting—with the aid of Hayward and Tyldesley—to begin with, against time, blocking in a way that he has never blocked before; but towards the finish, feeling absolutely sure of himself, playing in his natural style, and making the most brilliant cuts and drives that can be imagined. The people were frantic and danced with delight, and when the match was over, saved for England by Ranjitsinhji, every one of all the thousands present shouted till he was hoarse. It was a fitting demonstration, one worthy of the event, and Ranjitsinhji was obviously touched by it. He was all smiles and half tears.

To England's total score of 193 in the first innings Ranjitsinhji contributed 42, and in the second innings his 93 not out was, of course, easily top score.

THE DESECRATION OF THE TOMB.

It is a source of legitimate pride to the English that, whatever may be the case nearer home, their Empire abroad has ever stood on the sure foundation of religious tolerance. No persecutions have marked the advance of the English power in India. No religion has ever been justified in looking on that power as a foe. Nay, it has been a tradition handed down from the best and most far-sighted of Anglo-Indian statesmen that the very prejudices of the people were to be respected, and that manners and customs connected even indirectly with the religions of the country were to be treated with tenderness. For several generations the Company would not permit missionaries to enter their territory, until Parliament under the influence of the Evangelical movement insisted on their admission. Every law which affected religion, though it might be only indirectly, was carefully scrutinised. Even the abolition of suttee was only passed with much searching of heart. So that there grew up a belief that in this matter at least the Indians had nothing to fear. Their religion was respected, and the manners and customs which sprung from it, whether it was Mahometan or Hindu, were safe from any interference, save under the stress of necessity. Of late years, perhaps, this assurance has become weaker. The rulers know less of the country, and have less sympathy with the people. The missionaries are more numerous. The desire of philanthropic Imperialists to justify their aggressions by "civilising savages" and uprooting any old institutions which jar with the latest developments of Western civilisation becomes more threatening. Yet it has been felt that against all this should be placed the improvements in Western morals, of which we hear so much, the growth of the spirit of fraternity, of respect for the weak and the vanquished, of chivalrous honour to fallen enemies. It is to be feared that a recent event in the Sudan proves that these sentiments are still unknown to our Empire-builders, and there can be little doubt that it will cause no little anxiety to the more far-seeing of the Indian people.

It is, indeed, a curious way of showing our superior civilisation, this of destroying the tomb of our dead enemy and throwing his bones into the Nile. Practically condoned by the vote of the House of Commons on the grant to Lord Kitchener, it shows the nation in an odious light, careless alike of the religious feelings of the conquered, or of the common decencies of life. It may be true that no element of revenge entered into the proceeding; it may be true that its source was in public policy alone; yet the manner in which it was done was such as to give it the very worst appearance. At the best, it was evidently the act of a man callous to all feeling of honour to a brave foe long sleeping in death, callous to all respect for the religious sentiments of the living, callous to that common reverence for the tomb by which Christian and Moslem are joined together. Englishmen have long been ashamed of the conduct of their ancestors in their treatment of the last remains of Cromwell; nor has it seemed to them a matter of the first importance to enquire whether that conduct was dictated by policy or revenge. According indeed to the style of argument now in vogue it must have been due to policy; for, if the absence of revenge in the Mahdi's case is judged by Lord Kitchener's treatment of the dead leader's son-in-law, the reception of Cromwell's daughter at Court should prove the same in the earlier case.

As to the way in which this foul outrage was perpetrated, not one of all the three hundred and ninety-three who voted for the Kitchener grant stood up to offer any defence. Many were loud in their condemnation. Lord Charles Beresford said:—

> For his part he should like to have seen the remains not only taken away and buried somewhere else in Egypt, but taken away with some sort of ceremony, and with those sentiments of respect for the dead which every one should hold. That was the point which woke up the British people, because the chivalry of the country did not like to think that the remains of a man who had fought against us had been treated with some sort of spite.

But Lord Charles Beresford went on to defend Lord Kitchener by throwing the blame without any proof on his subordinates. Lord Kitchener was the man responsible for this outrage on the tomb, an outrage which has now been condoned by a vote of the House of Commons.

It is perhaps of little use to enquire whether the violation of the Mahdi's tomb had any real political advantage—of little use because that political advantage would have been equally obtained by reverently translating the body to some spot beyond the reach of the pilgrims and the warriors of the Sudan. It is, indeed, open to question whether we should not have done better to emphasise the distinction between the cause of the Mahdi and that of the Khalifa by showing that we warred with the latter alone. It is possible that in this case, as in so many others, it would have been found that the road of honour was also the way of safety. But if some removal of the remains was necessary, what excuse can there be for those who carried out this painful work in so dastardly a way? The story of the Mahdi's skull awaiting "disposal" is surely among the most ghastly in history, worthier of a people of savages than of the officers of a civilised army.

But there is another point of view from which the matter may be considered, not that of the immediate circumstances, of the supposed necessities of time and place, but of our position as a great Imperial power engaged, as the prophets of Imperialism tell us, on a great civilising mission for the elevation of backward races. It is then of the first importance that we should show ourselves superior to those whom we destroy or supplant, and that this superiority should be obvious to the most untutored mind. But when we come to consider reverence for the dead and respect for fallen enemies it becomes apparent that the superiority is not on our side. As Mr. Morley said in the debate on the grant to Lord Kitchener:—

> The Mahdi set a better example. I do not know whether any right hon. gentleman on the Front Bench will put me right, but I am told, and I believe it is true, that Sir Herbert Stewart, who met his death in the expedition of 1885, was buried in the Mahdi's territory, and that the remains of Sir Herbert Stewart are to this day absolutely intact.

Thus it appears that it is the Mahdi who respects the dead and his civilised foes who desecrate the tomb. Should not the unviolated grave of Sir Herbert Stewart have pleaded for an honourable treatment of the remains of his honourable foe?

There was another passage in Mr. Morley's speech which was full of warning. "You send," said he, "your soldiers to civilise savages. But take care the savages do not barbarize your soldiers." But here the English were not merely reduced to the level of those to whom they were to bring the light of civilisation. They fell below it. In any case the work of extending the Empire, of promoting morality by Maxim guns and social reform by massacre, is scarcely likely to promote a high standard either in those who carry it out or in those who profit by it; but if it is to be interspersed by the desecration of tombs, by the scattering of the bones of enemies, and by leaving the heads of dead rulers at the disposal of our successful generals, then indeed will it become gruesome and hideous beyond the work of any of the other destroyers of men.

But if we turn from the new to the old Empire, to those peoples which have been long under our sway, which have become reconciled to the loss of their independence, and look to us as the arbiters of their fate, such an incident may well cause a lively anxiety. So much of their welfare depends on the maintenance of our respect for the feelings, the customs, the religion of the people, that any sign that this respect was growing weaker could hardly fail to give occasion of alarm. And if at the same time it seems that the English are growing less fraternal, more puffed up with pride and wiser in their own conceit, more overbearing and more ready to think that even their evil actions partake of the nature of virtue, then indeed may the Indians and other subject peoples be inclined to despair.

THE BOMBAY GOVERNMENT AND HIGHER EDUCATION.—II.

By the Hon. C. H. Setalvad, B.A., LL.B.,
(Late Member of the Bombay Legislative Council, Syndic in Law and Fellow of Bombay University, Advocate of the Bombay High Court, etc.)

I find that subsequent to the publication in the columns of India of the facts connected with the refusal of the Government of Bombay to allow a private Law College under the presidency of the Hon. Mr. Justice Tyabji being started in Bombay, a question on the subject was put by Sir William Wedderburn on May 16 in the

House of Commons. I am rather amused at the answer given by Lord George Hamilton, which is both inaccurate and misleading.

I will first deal with the somewhat ridiculous attempt to show that the action of the Bombay Government is not inconsistent with the recommendations of the Indian Education Commission by saying that the Commission thought that the establishment of competing schools in one locality might involve "a clashing of interests and a waste of power." Now it is always very inconclusive and misleading to detach a clause or sentence like this from its context and use it in support of a particular argument that one may be advancing. Suffice it to say that the above is said by the Commission in a different part of the report and in a different connexion, and does not affect the clear policy and recommendations enunciated by them about higher education. The Government of India in appointing the Education Commission said that "it was the desire of Government to offer every encouragement to Native gentlemen to come forward and aid more extensively in education, because it is chiefly in this way that the Native community will be able to secure that freedom and variety of education which is an essential condition in any sound and complete educational system", for it is "not a healthy symptom that all the youth of the country should be cast, as it were, in the same Government educational mould," and that Government is therefore ready "to do all it can to foster such a spirit of independence and self-help." The Commission carefully considered this question and came to the conclusion that higher education was the best field for private effort, and that such effort should be systematically fostered and encouraged to such an extent that the State might eventually be able to transfer the control of some Government colleges to private management under certain conditions. They say:—

Institutions under private management have no necessary tendency towards uniformity and the only external authority which they acknowledge is that which is imposed equally on departmental and other institutions—the controlling authority of the University; consequently any measure that tends to increase the number of privately managed institutions widens at the same time the limits within which variety is possible by adding to the number of those who under a well-regulated system of aid need be bound by no departmental model and are free to work out their own ideas in their own way.

In recommending a gradual transfer of some of the collegiate institutions to private management, they say that "when permanence and efficiency are adequately secured we regard an institution that is provided by the people for themselves as greatly preferable to one that is provided by official agency." The Commission at the same time carefully guard against any steps being taken that may create the idea that the State wants to disconnect itself from higher education altogether and recognise the difficulty of proper private agency coming forward for some time to come to undertake the management of the institutions of a high order. But they lay down that private effort should be so created and fostered as ultimately to be able to take charge of some of these institutions. They say:—

It is only when, with the advance of university education in India, private effort has proved its capacity to take the lead in giving culture of the very highest kind, that the withdrawal of departmental institutions can be effected without injury to the education of the country as a whole. The first step therefore towards any large measure of withdrawal, and towards the saving such a measure will effect and the good of many kinds that it will do, must be *to afford every encouragement to private effort to show what is the very utmost it is able to accomplish.* . . . We believe that when the local Governments and the heads of the departments have shown in practice for a sufficient time that they *cordially favour the largest possible healthy development of every kind of private effort, and that they honour those who put forth such effort,* bodies of Native gentlemen will show that they feel the force of the call addressed to them. We believe Native gentlemen will recognise the need of helping the State in its gigantic task, and the need at the same time of securing a greater extension of advanced education and a greater variety in its type. We believe that influenced by these and similar motives they will come forward voluntarily, and come forward in rapidly increasing numbers, to take the honourable place which the State has reserved to them in establishing the civilisation of their country on a firm and a permanent foundation. (The italics are mine.)

They further impressed the necessity on the part of those who represent the State in educational affairs "of private persons being made thoroughly to feel that any judicious step for extending or improving the means of education will meet with approval from the State." The Government of India endorsed all that the Commission said on this subject. They say:—

It is not, as has been repeatedly declared, in any degree the wish of the Government of India to discourage higher education in any way whatever. On the contrary it believes it to be one of its most important duties to spread and foster it. What it specially, however, desires is to secure assistance to the limited funds of the State by calling forth every available private agency in connexion with every branch of public instruction. It is in connexion with higher education, and in view of the direct pecuniary advantages which it holds out to those who follow it, that the Government thinks it can most properly insist on the fullest development of the principle of self-help.

How the decision of the Bombay Government, who, according to Lord George Hamilton, "considered that it was not advisable that the control of the higher legal education should be wholly or partially in private hands," is not inconsistent with all the views and recommendations of the Education Commission above set forth, I, not possessing the critical faculty of the noble lord in charge of India's destinies, confess my utter inability to perceive. For it must be remembered that neither the Bombay Government nor the Secretary of State for them has dared to raise any special objections to the merits of the particular college, but they object to any private enterprise, however respectable, however well-organised, taking any part in legal higher education. Again, the control of higher education in the faculty of Arts in the town of Bombay is in a great measure in private hands (there being about four private Arts colleges against one Government) and the control of a part of legal education (the F.LL.B. classes) in important centres in the mofussil is in private hands. Moreover, in Calcutta the control of higher legal education is entirely in private hands, there being four private colleges in the town of Calcutta and several others in the province teaching up to the full university law degree, while there is no law department in the Government Presidency college. How higher legal education in Bombay stands on a different footing Lord George Hamilton can alone explain.

I am of course dealing with the reason put forward in the House of Commons on behalf of the Bombay Government, in paragraph 1 of the answer, inconsistent though it is with the principle laid down in paragraph 3, that each case must be dealt with on its own merits. That Government in their resolution refusing the authorisation, do not rely on the reason given by Lord George Hamilton. They say they want to make their Law School efficient; they require more funds to do so; and as the funds can only be had by raising the fees, they will raise the fees and keep all the students to themselves, and will not allow any to be diverted to another college. Thus, as I pointed out in my former article, Government want to be monopolists of higher legal education so that they may be able to raise the fees sufficiently high to pay all the expenses of maintaining the institution in an efficient condition, without spending a pie out of their revenues on it. It appears that free trade is in bad luck in India, and the paternal hand of protection is to be extended not only to sugar factories but to colleges and schools.

In the first paragraph of his answer, Lord George Hamilton gives the House to understand that the Bombay Government are taking steps to make the Government Law school "equal to all demands." Neither the Bombay Government nor the Committee of Enquiry, whose unanimous report they accepted, pretend to do so. The Committee distinctly say that their recommendations have been limited by financial considerations and that they have made only such proposals as could be carried out by raising the present fees by 50 per cent. The Committee further

recognise that the classes are very large (150 in each) and think that they should not be materially increased, and might be reduced with advantage. But such recommendations can only be carried out, under present circumstances, by a further increase in the fees to provide additional professors, or by reducing the remuneration of professors. The Committee cannot recommend either of these courses and are therefore compelled to leave the classes as they are for the present.

Government in accepting the report say that they recognise "that the recommendations are not intended to be exhaustive or final, and that their scope has been necessarily limited by the funds available." This is certainly not making the institution "equal to all demands."

In the second paragraph of his answer Lord George Hamilton says that every application must be dealt with on its own merits and that he sees no reason to doubt the soundness of the decision arrived at in this case. Curiously enough he says in paragraph 1, "I have no information as to the character of the private institution referred to in this question or of its staff of professors." It is only

given to Lord George Hamilton to come to the conclusion that a decision arrived at on the merits of a particular case is sound when he admits he has no information whatever about the merits. The truth is he could not say anything against the merits of a scheme that had met with the approval of the University, the body best fitted to judge of academic requirements, especially in view of the fact that in adding three professors to their school last month, the Bombay Government could not do better than offer two of the chairs to two gentlemen on the staff of the proposed private college.

The policy of reaction and distrust in the matter of higher education has been for some time in the ascendant in Bombay and other parts of India, but it has been of late accentuated by the present composition of the Government of Bombay. When I say so I mean nothing personally against any of the members of that Government, but I only deplore the entire absence of the judicial element in it. It had been the recognised tradition all these years to have one judicial member, taken from among the civilian judges of the High Court. It often used to happen that that member had been very intimately connected with the Bombay University. For instance, Mr. Gibbs, Sir Raymond West, and Mr. Herbert Birdwood were for many years vice-chancellors of the University. As of necessity these men carried with them, besides an intimate knowledge of higher education and its working, an amount of sympathy for the advancement and development of such education. This coupled with their judicial training made them bring to bear in the consideration of some of these questions, notably that of legal education, that grasp and breadth of view which it is not the fault but the misfortune of persons trained wholly in the executive branch to lack.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

(FROM A PARLIAMENTARY CORRESPONDENT.)

LAST Monday's sitting in the House of Commons is one that I shall not soon forget. The question to be discussed was whether Lord Kitchener should be given £30,000 for his services in the Sudan, and the House was crammed through the greater part of the sitting. The peers' gallery was crowded to excess, and some noble lords were obliged to be satisfied with getting occasional peeps over the shoulders of other peers. Early in the day it was rumoured that Lord Kitchener, who had that day reached London, meant to come into the House and listen to the Government's eulogies, but this was generally discredited. It was felt that no man with a particle of taste would take such a step. The sequel however showed that refined taste is not Lord Kitchener's strong point, for he came into the peers' gallery early; he sat in the most prominent seat; he smiled and beamed with satisfaction when his valour and his genius and his other wonderful qualities were eulogised with almost delirious enthusiasm. And more remarkable than that, he laughed again and again ostentatiously during Mr. John Morley's scathing attack on that horrible and disgusting body-snatching incident.

Mr. Balfour's praises of the Sirdar when proposing the vote were ridiculously overdone. It struck me that Mr. Balfour was not quite at his ease. He shouted too much; it was as if a man accustomed to play delicate and refined comedy was suddenly called upon to produce the broader effects of the music-hall stage. If all that Mr. Balfour said is to be accepted, then the Sirdar is the greatest general and hero of all time—and if one may judge from Lord Kitchener's approving looks he thought that was a very proper view to take. The Tories meantime bellowed their applause wherever there was a chance. They cheered Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman too when he rose and said that he was in favour of the grant and that he admired the Sirdar as much as anyone on the other side. But directly he began to hint disapproval of the body-snatching they shouted impatiently. Indeed they appeared to be unwilling that anything other than praise hot and strong and "laid on with a trowel," as the saying is, should be listened to. Sir Henry however stuck to it, and described the act as an infraction of good policy, good feeling, good taste and good manners. But the greater part of the speech was one of praise.

Very different was Mr. John Morley's performance. He was jeered at and interrupted continually, but he went on, and from beginning to end the speech consisted almost entirely of denunciation of the "Mahdi's head" incident, as it is called. He described the act as "disgusting and revolting" (a laugh from the Sirdar), he said that we must take care that in sending generals to civilize the savages we do not let the savages barbarise the generals. In another place he stated that it was reported that in destroying the tomb and dispersing the remains the Sirdar acted on the advice of certain Mahometan officers. "Hear, hear," shouted the Tories. "Then has it come to this," exclaimed Mr. Morley with some passion, "that on a question affecting our standard of civilization we are to allow Mahometans to decide the standard for us?" Again, he scored one distinctly a little later in connexion with the decapitation of the Mahdi's corpse. "It was not decapitated," interrupted Mr. Balfour. Mr. Morley immediately read from the Sirdar's own report that the bones were flung into the Nile—"the skull only was preserved." How could they deny decapitation in such circumstances? Mr. Balfour, interrupting, said that the head had become separated from the body by the process of natural decay, upon which Mr. Morley replied, "a gruesome comment upon a gruesome matter!"—and again the Sirdar smiled. Mr. Morley pointed out also that the Mahdi and his people had shown us a more excellent way by treating with reverence and respect the tomb of Sir Herbert Stewart, who was killed in war in the Sudan.

When Mr. Morley had finished it was evident that Mr. Balfour thought he really must refer to this degrading incident, for in his first speech he had quite ignored it. It was all a matter of policy, he said. It was necessary after having shattered the military forces of Mahdism to destroy also the superstition on which it rested, and to show that the man who had been deemed a prophet by his followers was only a man after all. "What would you have done" he asked Mr. Morley "if you had felt that the removal of these remains was necessary to the safety of all the white people in the Sudan?" Mr. Morley replied "I would have had them decently buried elsewhere," and Mr. Balfour was compelled to own that "perhaps that would have been better." The question of the head was never properly cleared up. The Government state that it was buried at Wady Halfa. That is 1,400 miles from the place in which it was seized, and it would be interesting to know how it got there, and also why it was not flung into the Nile with the other bones. The Government said nothing on this point—but it is perfectly notorious that the skull was going to be kept as a grizzly trophy by one of our officers, and there is no doubt that its burial was only hurriedly undertaken after the outburst of indignation in this country had warned these ghouls that they were being watched.

The rest of the debate is not of much interest. Some of the more noisy and fire-eating Tories delivered panygerics, which would have been ludicrously overdone in the case of Napoleon or Wellington. More than one turned directly to the Sirdar, and gazing up at this much-belauded soldier were boiling over with enthusiasm. They reminded me of the Natives I have seen prostrating themselves before an idol—with this very real exception, the Natives are sincere, whereas these noisy politicians have one eye fixed steadily on the main chance.

It was in the midst of a scene like this, not the most edifying scene perhaps, that Mr. Robert Wallace of Edinburgh rose and began what promised to be a witty speech against the vote. Meantime the Tories were in full cry, shouting "'Vide, 'vide," and giving tongues like a pack of young foxhounds barking for their porridge. The heat was quite overwhelming and Mr. Wallace soon seemed confused, he fumbled for his glasses, he hesitated, rubbed his forehead, attempted to drink some water and failed, and then he sank back in his seat. Meantime the pitiless chorus of "'Vide, 'vide" went on, and those were probably the last sounds which reached the ears of the stricken man. For Mr. Wallace was really dead when he sank back. It is true that he did not cease to breathe for an hour or two, but he never recovered consciousness. John Burns, who is as fine a man both as regards strength and nerve and that quick instinct which leads a man to do the right thing at the right time and in the right way, as there is in the House, pushed his way to the collapsed member. He stooped down and placing one arm under-

neath his shoulders and the other behind his knees, Mr. Burns lifted this stout, heavy man as if he had been a child and walked out of the House with him. Mr. Wallace was placed in a room behind the Chair for a time; but it was seen that the case was not only serious but desperate. He was therefore carried across the lobby by four policemen; the division bells were calling members to vote on the very subject on which he attempted to address the House as his dying form passed out—perhaps as striking an illustration of that memorable saying of Burke, "What shadows we are, and what shadows we pursue," as has ever been witnessed. He died within three hours of the time when he rose to speak, and within two hours of the cry of "Who goes home?"—a cry which had a deeper significance for him than for others that night. He was a great wit, a scholar, had been minister of old Greyfriars Church, Edinburgh, Professor of Church History in Edinburgh, editor of the *Scotsman;* was a barrister, a lecturer, a writer and a member of Parliament. His speeches were looked forward to with eagerness, for he was sure to be sparkling; but as he was a man of independent views, no one could tell exactly in which direction his hits were likely to come. By a singular and melancholy coincidence Mr. Wallace was the second member for Edinburgh to die within three days. Mr. Cox the member for South Edinburgh died on the previous Friday, and now there is a vacancy in East Edinburgh also.

The Indian countervailing duties on sugar have not been forgotten in this country, though I have no doubt Government wish they had. The subject will come up for discussion in the Commons on June 15, and on that occasion Sir Henry Fowler will move that a humble address be presented to her Majesty praying that she will be pleased to disallow the Indian Tariff Act, 1899. On the other hand Mr. Wylie will move as an amendment "that in the interests of India and of free trade throughout the world this House approves of the Indian Tariff Act, 1899." The notion of backing up these duties in the interests of free trade all over the world is original at least, and tempts one to say that Mr. Wylie deserves his name. It is of course practically certain that the Government will have its own way, and that the "talking Viceroy" will be supported. But the House is sure to hear some plain truths from Mr. Maclean, and when he is roused, as he is about this question, he is always worth hearing. I have heard Lord George Hamilton say more than once that he is really most anxious that this question should be thoroughly discussed—so I am glad for his sake that he can have the wish of his heart gratified on the 15th. I hope he will enjoy the experience, but I doubt it.

Wednesday in the House was at once interesting, laughable at times beyond all description, and eminently satisfactory. I think I have explained already how the Half-Timers Bill had been obstructed and the wish of nine-tenths of the House thwarted by a little group representing the most selfish elements in Lancashire. Last Wednesday this Bill was second on the paper and it was feared that the first Bill, the Service Franchise Bill, would be discussed at sufficient length to block the way of the other. The night before a number of Liberals resolved to come down early and do what they could to clear the way. They turned up promptly, the Tories were not there, and the Liberals carried an amendment to the Service Franchise Bill which enormously increases its operation. I have seldom seen anything more funny than poor Sir John Maple's consternation when he found what had been done to his Bill. He protested, gasped, and finally stalked off in a bad temper. Then the Liberals said that as the Tories were not present in their usual numbers it would be unfair to move further amendments to the Service Franchise Bill, so they dropped them all, and the Bill went through its Committee Stage. The joke is that by carrying that one amendment they have ensured a report stage at which they can propose all they have dropped.

In this way the Half-Timers Bill came on at once; it turned out that most of the amendments to it were out of order and so this Bill, for which so many good men trembled, was through its Committee stage in a very few minutes. The House then gave itself up to fun, which soon became fast and furious. Only two members of the Government were present and they were minor lights—Mr. Jesse Collings and Mr. T. W. Russell. That seasoned old obstructionist Mr. James Lowther appealed to Mr. Collings again and again to explain the views of the Cabinet on this or that subject. The members roared, as well they might, for to ask Mr. Collings to explain the views of the Cabinet is equivalent to asking the door-keeper at the Bank of England to express the opinions of the Governor.

CHRONICLE OF THE WEEK.

THURSDAY, June 1.—The House of Commons went into Committee of Supply, resuming the consideration of the Civil Service Estimates.

At the sitting of commission No. 2 of the Peace Conference, a small committee was appointed to settle the details of a method of extending the Geneva Convention to maritime warfare. The United States delegate proposed to apply to private property at sea the article of the Brussels Convention excluding from capture private property on land. Objection was raised to the discussion of the proposal on the ground that it was not covered by Count Muravieff's circular, and eventually it was decided to refer the matter to a plenary sitting of the Conference. The sub-committee of commission No. 3 decided to submit to the Conference a recommendation for the prohibition of missiles such as explosive bullets, and a suggestion that for five years the States represented at the Conference should pledge themselves only to use in their armies the rifles with which they were armed at present.—The text of Sir Julian Pauncefote's proposal for a permanent international arbitration tribunal was published.

Sir A. Milner and President Kruger had their first meeting at the Government House, Bloemfontein, yesterday, when President Steyn introduced his two distinguished visitors to one another. The meeting lasted twenty minutes. In the afternoon a business conference was held which sat for over an hour and a half. It was agreed not to divulge the proceedings to the Press.

Major Marchand and his companions of the Fashoda expedition arrived in Paris this morning, and, after being welcomed by various personages at the railway station, were driven amid dense and shouting crowds to the Ministry of Marine.

FRIDAY, June 2.—The House of Commons resumed in Committee of Supply the consideration of the Civil Service Estimates.

The customary list of Queen's birthday honours was issued. Baronetcies were conferred on the Right Hon. S. J. Way, Chief Justice of South Australia, Professor Burdon Sanderson, and Messrs. S. Hoare, M.P., T. Brooke, T. Salt, and John Usher. Knighthoods were conferred on sixteen gentlemen, among them Mr. Alma Tadema, R.A., and among the promotions in the Order of the Bath Sir C. S. Scott, British Ambassador at St. Petersburg, and Mr. H. M. Stanley, M.P., received the G.C.B., and Colonel Farquharson, Mr. G. H. Murray, Mr. W. H. Preece, and Professor Michael Foster the K.C.B. There were numerous promotions in and appointments to the other civil and military Orders; and the style and title of Lord Mayor was conferred upon the Mayor of Bristol.

Mr. R. Cox, M.P. for the Southern Division of Edinburgh, died at Aix-les-Bains. He was born in 1845.

Sir A. Milner and President Kruger held another conference at Bloemfontein on Thursday.—The hearing of the charge against the alleged Johannesburg conspirators at Pretoria was postponed at the request of the High Commissioner. "In order to dispose of rumours that the British military authorities were concerned in the affair and to assist the local authorities, the British Agent will," it was stated, "provide for the defence of the prisoners."

The Naval Sub-Committee of the Peace Conference entrusted with the revision of the Geneva Convention as applicable to maritime warfare held a long sitting, and the British, French, German, and Russian delegates arrived at an agreement as to the revision.

SATURDAY, June 3.—The Court of Cassation in Paris pronounced judgment in the Dreyfus case. The judgment set forth that the proof that documents now shown to have no relation to Dreyfus had been submitted to the Court-martial which convicted him, and the evidence as to the real authorship of the *bordereau*, constituted new facts tending to establish the innocence of the condemned, and that his alleged confession was not established by evidence. The Court therefore quashed and annulled the judgment and sentence passed on Dreyfus on December 22, 1894, and directed the accused to be tried before a Court-martial at Rennes on the question—Was Dreyfus guilty of having in 1894 practised machinations or carried on communications with a foreign Power or one of its agents for the purpose of inducing it to engage in hostilities or wage war against France, or of furnishing it with the means of doing so by supplying it with the notes and documents enumerated in the *bordereau*? The effect of the judgment was to place General Mercier and all others who were aimed at, by name or otherwise in M. Ballot-Beaupré's report and the formal judgment, in the position of accused persons.—The French Government ordered Dreyfus to be brought back to France

at once in the cruiser "Sfax," and he was expected to arrive at Brest about the end of June.

The Brussels Conference section of commission No. 2 of the Peace Conference met when the revision of the Brussels Convention was continued. The sub-committee of the arbitration commission began to-day the discussion of the British, American, and Russian projects for establishing a permanent arbitration tribunal. The American scheme for special mediation was to be recommended by the sub-committee for the favourable consideration of the Conference.

The conference between Sir A. Milner and President Kruger was continued at Bloemfontein this morning.

MONDAY, June 5.—In the House of Commons Mr. Balfour moved the vote of £30,000 to Lord Kitchener as "an acknowledgement of his eminent services in planning and conducting the expedition in the Sudan." The vote, which was opposed by Mr. John Morley, Mr. C. P. Scott and others, was carried by 393 votes against 51.

At a Cabinet Council held in Paris the French Government decided on some important measures. The Advocate-General who conducted the prosecution of M. Déroulède at the Seine Assizes was dismissed, and the president of the Court was to be brought before the Council of Discipline. It was resolved to bring before the Chamber the question of the impeachment of General Mercier, to prosecute Esterhazy for having procured and used certain documents in connexion with the Dreyfus case, and to institute an enquiry into General de Pellieux's conduct of the prosecution of Esterhazy. General Roget and his brigade were to be transferred to Orleans, and three officers who took part in the Auteuil disorders were to be tried by Court-Martial. In view of these decisions to-day's sitting of the Chamber was a stormy one.

The Arbitration Commission of the Peace Conference adopted the scheme for the exercise of good offices and mediation. It consisted of eight articles, six of which were taken with some modifications from the Russian project, while one had been brought forward by the Italian delegate, and the eighth was the American scheme for special mediation.

Sir A. Milner and President Kruger continued their conference at Bloemfontein.

TUESDAY, June 6.—In the House of Lords, on the motion of Lord Russell of Killowen, the Prevention of Corruption Bill was read a second time.

In the House of Commons the London Government Bill was considered on report. It was decided by 196 votes to 161 that no person should be disqualified by sex or marriage for being elected or being an alderman or councillor.

Mr. R. Wallace, M.P. for East Edinburgh, who was seized with an attack of cerebral congestion while speaking on Monday night in the House of Commons, died early this morning in Westminster Hospital. The deceased, who had been a distinguished clergyman of the Church of Scotland, and subsequently for a short time occupied the position of editor of the *Scotsman* in succession to the late Alexander Russel, was in his 68th year.

Sir A. Milner and President Kruger concluded their conferences at Bloemfontein on Monday. A hopeful feeling prevailed there that an agreement had been concluded.

WEDNESDAY, June 7.—A series of surprises was experienced in the House of Commons. The Servants' Franchise Bill, which was in charge of Sir Blundell Maple, was the first order of the day, and on its being reached the Opposition, who were momentarily in a majority, carried a hostile amendment by 58 votes to 40. They declined to proceed with other amendments, and the Bill was at once reported to the House. Mr. Robson's Education of Children Bill was the second order; and the Chairman having ruled that some proposed new clauses were inadmissible, opposition was withdrawn and the measure passed through Committee amid loud cheers. Other Bills were passed over in the absence of their sponsors.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR.

VILIFICATION OF INDIAN CHARACTER.

To THE EDITOR OF "INDIA."

Sir,—Increasingly of late has it been borne in upon me the disastrous consequences certain sooner or later to result from the persistent vilification of Indian character in certain quarters —often, I regret to have to say, missionary. I am desirous of making a collection of testimonies to the contrary given by officials and other residents in India and writers about India. I know of no surer means by which I can be put on the track of such than by appealing to the readers, Indian and British, of INDIA. References to writings or, better still, copies of passages testifying to the general good character and disposition of the Indian people, with names of authors, will be gladly received by me, and will in all cases be acknowledged.—Yours, etc., ALFRED WEBB.

"Shelmaliere," Orwell Park, Rathgar,
Dublin, Ireland, June 2, 1899.

NOTES FROM BOMBAY.

[FROM AN INDIAN CORRESPONDENT.]

BOMBAY, May 19.

The principal topic of the week in Indian journals in every part of the country has been the article in the current *Quarterly Review* on Lord Elgin's administration and the many statements therein made regardless of truth. Reviewing the contribution the *Pioneer* joins issue with the writer, and does not hesitate to observe that the article is more in the nature of an unqualified apology of the administration of Lord Elgin than a fair and impartial verdict on it. It will be remembered that the leading Anglo-Indian journal gave a fair estimate of Lord Elgin's career on the eve of his retirement. The *Pioneer* resolutely adheres to it, and observes that whatever contemporary chronicles and eulogists may say, the verdict of history will be the same as that which almost all India has already pronounced. Meanwhile ministers and personal friends are welcome to sing loud and indulge in hyperbole at banquets. None is deceived by those platitudinous utterances.

As to the writer's libel on educated Indians and his fiction regarding Lord Elgin's administration, not a single Indian journal has a good word to say of it. They are indignant at the liberties taken with truth. The fact is that diatribes of the character abounding in the article carry their own condemnation. But what is the moral? This only, that the great English nation has to be discerning and circumspect in reference to all that is said about India by the official white Brahmins who out-Brahmin the black ones of the soil. When they stoop, even the best of them who have held high offices in India, to whitewash their own Service or Viceroys of the unpopular type of Lord Elgin, Englishmen should understand how rotten must be the case of those in whose behalf they write long briefs.

The *Gazette of India* gives all the papers in connexion with the sugar controversy. It is to be presumed that they are identical with those published on your side in the form of a Blue-book and presented to Parliament. A glance at these papers tells even the most superficial reader that the Indian Government had no justification for that legislation. It was prompted by selfish interests, pampered by equally interested Chambers of Commerce, and finally promoted under the all-powerful influence of the Colonial Secretary through the Secretary of State for India. Lord George Hamilton and Lord Curzon do not come well out of this miserable affair. There are many statements of even the interested parties which could be easily challenged, while the mass of statistics are so incomplete, albeit elaborately tabulated and paraded, as to be inconclusive on their very face. The pronouncements of the Bombay Government and even of the Government of the North-West Provinces are clear enough. They do not justify the legislation. It remains to be seen how the controversy is carried on in and out of Parliament. The leading organs of Anglo-Indian opinion are as yet silent or simply mumbling. In Bombay the *Times of India* alone has spoken out but its remarks are of the usual vague sort. It has not been able to justify the Act by the light of the papers. The contentions of the *Champion* have been emphasised. The *Gujarati*, the *Bombay Samachar*, and the *Indu-prakash* have already condemned the Act since the publication of the papers. What the leading Indian journals in the other presidencies and provinces say will be communicated later. But there is a distinct change of opinion in Bombay. People are seeing through the game played. "The bubble is burst" as the *Champion* observes.

The signallers' strike continues. The G.I.P. Railway Company is obdurate and refuses to give any hearing to the grievances of the strikers. The interested organs of Anglo-Indian opinion are, as usual, representing the strikers as the sinners with no redeeming or extenuating circumstances in their favour, and the capitalist company, backed by the State, as the injured innocent. Of course, all this is purely one-sided. The public are enabled from the correspondence daily appearing to judge for themselves. That the strikers were driven to exasperation in taking the step they did is an undoubted fact. That they are firm in the conviction of the equity of their demand is another fact. The company affects to show firmness; but whether it has internal strength may be a question. Anyhow the way in which both passenger and goods traffic is carried shows that all is not well, despite outward representations of efficiency. These have to be taken with a large grain of salt. The company is vexed because it thought these men would never strike. Because they have struck, and because they are constitutionally fighting their battle, the company is wrath and trying to put them down. This is a new phase of capital and labour in this country. Let us see what it comes to.

THE SUGAR DUTY ACT.

[From the "Economist."]

The tender regard which Lord George Hamilton has been expressing for the independence of the Indian Government in fiscal affairs has been made to look very ludicrous by the publication of the correspondence with regard to the imposition of countervailing duties upon imports of bounty-fed sugar into India. Over and over again, when questioned in the House of Commons, he has spoken of that measure as due to the spontaneous action of the Indian Government, action with which it would have been wrong for the home authorities to interfere. Thus, for instance, replying on one occasion to Mr. Maclean, he rather pertly said, "I have more than once told the hon. member that I have no intention whatever of interfering with the independence of the local authority." Of course, he was at once reminded that in the matter of the cotton duties the independence of the local authority had been very considerably interfered with, and now that the proceedings in connexion with the sugar duties have been disclosed, it is found that the alleged initiative of the Indian Government is a complete fiction. The correspondence opens with a letter from the Government of India to the Secretary of State, dated May 5, 1898, which refers to a proposal made for the representation of India at the Sugar Bounties Conference that was to be held at Brussels in the following June. The proposal originated with certain Indian mercantile firms, who had drawn up a "note on the effects of the unrestricted importation of bounty-fed sugar on the sugar-cane industry of India," and who suggested not only that India should be represented at the Conference, but also that in the event of no agreement for the abolition of bounties being arrived at, India should impose countervailing duties. The first of these suggestions was endorsed by the Bengal Chamber of Commerce, but not the second, and the views of the Indian Government were thus expressed in the despatch already referred to: "An examination of the statements in the note on the effect on the sugar-cane industry of India of the unrestricted competition of bounty-fed sugar leads us to the conclusion that while the competition of imported sugar (of which three-fifths are cane sugar) may have reduced the profits of the refining industry, it does not appear to have materially affected the product. He relies mainly on the demand for unrefined sugar, which constitutes seven-eighths of the trade, and in respect of these seven-eighths there seems no reason to apprehend that the producers' profits have been lowered by the increased importation of beet sugar. While, therefore, we adhere to the position stated in the financial despatches of February 14, 1888, and of May 14, 1889, and are prepared to press for the abolition of the sugar bounties and to join in an International Convention for that purpose, we are not prepared to levy countervailing duties on sugar imported into India."

No further step is recorded as having been taken until August 25, when Lord George Hamilton advised the Indian Government that the Brussels Conference had separated without achieving a definite result, and added: "At paragraph 4 of your letter, dated May 5, 1898, it was stated that you were not prepared to levy countervailing duties on bounty-fed sugar imported into India. I should be glad to receive more fully your views on this proposal as her Majesty's Government, now that they are in possession of the views of Foreign Governments, must consider during the next few months the course they should pursue." That was a pretty broad hint to the Indian Government to reconsider their former decision adverse to the imposition of countervailing duties, but a very much broader one was to come later. On January 3, 1899, Mr. Chamberlain forwarded to the Secretary of State for India a petition signed by 8,000 planters in Mauritius, and on January 20, Lord George Hamilton, in forwarding that petition to the Indian Government, wrote:—"In my despatch, dated August 25, 1898, ... I asked for a fuller expression of the views of the Government of India with reference to a remark in their letter of May, 1898, that they were not prepared to impose countervailing duties on bounty-fed sugar imported into India. Further papers received during the past few months do not give ground for anticipating an early result from the discussions at the Brussels Conference of last summer. . . . . I have recently received from the Colonial Office copy of a memorial sent by 8,000 Mauritius planters and others to your Government in October, 1898, praying that countervailing duties may be imposed on bounty-fed sugars imported into India. I forward copy of these papers. It will be seen that Mr. Secretary Chamberlain apprehends that in present circumstances bounty-fed sugars will drive Mauritius sugar out of the Indian market, and will entail ruin and distress on a colony where the majority of the population are natives of India or their descendants, and that he requests that the memorial may receive the favourable consideration of your Excellency's Government. In this request I concur, and I have no doubt but that you will take steps for dealing with this important matter at an early date. If, on reconsideration you should see reasons for modifying the views expressed by the Government of India in May last, and for advising the levying of countervailing duties on bounty-fed sugars imported into India the "precise measures you would propose, either legislative or otherwise, should be clearly stated. I forward copy of a paper which shows how the countervailing duties on bounty-fed sugar are practically worked in the United States." Here not only is the imposition of countervailing duties urged upon the Indian Government, but the plan to be adopted and which has been adopted is suggested. It has to be noted, too, that two days before this despatch was sent, Lord George Hamilton advised the Viceroy by telegraph that it was about to be sent, and the same spirit of hot haste characterised the subsequent proceedings, as the following correspondence will show:—

From Secretary of State to Viceroy, February 24, 1899.

My telegram of January 24. Desire to know if you propose to pass an Act this Session imposing countervailing duties.

From Viceroy to Secretary of State, February 25, 1899.

Your telegram of February 24. Sugar bounties. Propose to legislate at once on American model.

From Secretary of State to Viceroy, March 1, 1899.

Sugar duties. Suggested legislation approved by her Majesty's Government. When will Indian Government's intention be announced?

From Viceroy to Secretary of State, March 3, 1899.

Your telegram of March 1. Sugar duties. Bill for imposing duties on lines of American law will be brought forward on March 10 and published in newspapers on March 13.

From Secretary of State to Viceroy, March 11, 1899.

Sugar. Countervailing duties. On what day do you expect Bill to be passed?

From Viceroy to Secretary of State, March 14, 1899.

Your telegram of March 11 last. Hope to pass Bill on March 20, but am considering whether, as regards pending contracts, its operation shall be postponed for about three weeks.

From Secretary of State to Viceroy, March 18, 1899.

Your telegram of March 14. Sugar Duties Bill. Please telegraph as soon as you have given your assent. Also telegraph substance of principal clauses as finally passed.

Such is a plain unvarnished record of the proceedings that led up to the imposition of the duties. And having it before him, is there any reasoning being who can accept Lord George Hamilton's assertion that the Indian Government acted upon its own initiative, and that the Home Government merely refrained from "interfering with the independence of the local authority"? That is a complete travesty of the truth. Of course, there was no formal dictation on the part of the Home Government, that amount of respect for appearances one would expect to be observed. But as to the actual dictation there can be no question. True it is also that the Viceroy and the members of the Legislative Council, who, bowing to that dictation, reversed in February last the decision they had arrived at in the previous May, profess to be acting only in the interests of India itself. But at the time they decided upon imposing the duties they were confessedly in the dark as to the exact way in which those interests were being affected. Thus, in a telegram from the Viceroy, dated February 1, we find the following passage:—"The present market price of imported sugars is unusually low. They compete with Native sugar, both refined and coarse. We are enquiring how far these effects are likely to be permanent." To legislate first and enquire after is thus the course that has been followed.

And thus far at any rate the enquiry does not appear to have justified the legislation. Another of Lord George Hamilton's assertions is that opinion in India is almost unanimous in favour of the duties. Well, as to that let us look at the replies to the enquiry of the Indian Government in the order they appear in the correspondence. First we have a report from the Secretary to the Government of Bombay, Revenue Department, who states that "the importation of European sugars during recent years were altogether abnormal, and that they neither lowered the price of the refined sugar consumed in the Bombay Presidency, nor checked the cultivation of the cane or the production of unrefined sugar to which practically the whole of the cane produced in the Presidency is devoted." He goes on to say that the Chambers of Commerce of Bombay and Karachi are clearly of opinion that in the interests of trade countervailing duties against European sugar are uncalled for, and he concludes thus:—"On the whole his Excellency the Governor in Council is of opinion that neither the commercial nor the agricultural interests of this Presidency are injuriously affected by the increasing imports of refined sugar, or call at present for the imposition of countervailing duties upon that part of the imported sugar, the export of which to this country is aided by bounties." Next the Chief Commissioner of Assam "does not apprehend any falling off of land revenue in consequence of the abandonment of sugar cultivation in this Province." We pass by Berar, in which we are told by the President that there "the production of sugar possesses no importance," and also Ajmere-Merwara, as to which the Commissioner states that "the area under sugar cultivation is very small, but so far no sign of the plant going out of cultivation has been recorded." From Madras however we get the expression of opinion by the Chamber of Commerce that a further fall in the price of refined sugar must lead "eventually to the curtailment if not to the complete extinction of the Indian sugar industry," and that there are no "visible means of escape from this calamity other than the abolition of the bounties by international agreement, or the imposition in this country (India) of countervailing import duties on bounty-fed sugar." As against this however has to be set the report by the Revenue Secretary to the Punjab Government, to the effect that "there is certainly no tendency towards a fall in price, so that it cannot be said either that the profits of cultivation are declining, or that refined sugar has yet entered into competition with gur" [the Native product]. And lastly, we are informed by the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh that while he thinks further experience is necessary "to the formation of a clear and precise judgment as to the effects of the importation of foreign sugar on the indigenous industry he is inclined to infer [from facts stated] that in all probability the foreign competition has already begun to affect the Native sugar industry; that it has probably already affected the cultivation of cane in the central and eastern districts, and that it is likely to produce continued and increasing injury to the sugar industry generally and to the agricultural and labouring population of the cane-producing districts."

Now, if anyone can deduce from these replies evidence of unanimity of opinion in favour of the imposition of countervailing duties, or justification for the headlong haste with which the measure was introduced and rushed through, we confess ourselves unable to do so. The whole affair seems to us a device to benefit Mauritius sugar planters at the expense of the Indian consumers of refined sugar, against whom prices are sought to be raised. And that, we hold, is a mean device for if the Colonial Office desires to extend to Mauritius any such help it should do so at our own cost, and not seek by underhand means to throw it upon our Indian subjects who have had no voice in the matter. And a word or two may be added as to Lord Curzon's share in the matter. In the short time he has been in

India he has created for himself a reputation as the most loquacious of Viceroys, and he seems to have got his head in the air. In supporting the Bill for imposing the duties he talked with some contempt of the "mutterings of the high priest at Free-trade shrines," and spoke of the measure as setting "an example of far-reaching significance," which may "even be regarded as a factor in the Imperial problem." Seeing how Lord Curzon has been moving simply in response to the strings pulled from the Colonial and India Offices, this assumption of far-reaching influence and authority is delightfully amusing. But is it quite the business of a Viceroy to give such droll performances?

"THE POLICE CONFESSIONAL."

[From the "Pioneer."]

The administration report for the Punjab for the year 1897 contains some observations of the Sessions Judge of Umballa which point to a serious obstacle in the way of justice, and also suggest a simple and efficacious corrective to the defect. Confessions in this country, as everybody knows, are as frequent as they are unreliable. Even in England the judges have remarked on the curious fact that confessions to the police are frequently forthcoming in cases where the prosecution has no other evidence on which to support a conviction, while they are usually absent in cases where there is strong independent evidence against the prisoner. The Legislature in India has enacted many provisions to ensure the authenticity and genuineness of confessions, but the result has not been so successful as might have been hoped. Confessions are still produced in astounding cases where apparently the prisoners must have been seized with an almost divine spirit of contrition, and confessions of this kind are still put in evidence by police officers who at the same time have to acknowledge themselves baffled in their attempts to unearth independent testimony. The procedure is simple. A guileless prisoner, unacquainted with the ethics of impartiality which govern the administration of criminal justice under British rule, is informed that if he confesses he will save the time and trouble of the court in trying him, that this will appease the judge, and that he will at the most get a warning. It is pointed out to him that in the alternative, should he try to defend himself, he will be considered contumacious and be visited with the utmost punishment that the court can inflict. If he really is a simpleton, or if he is wise enough to remember that he has to revert to police custody, he follows the suggestion of the police and seals his doom; otherwise he engages a pleader and laughs at his would-be trappers. It is a matter of common occurrence for a man to retract his confession when he discovers where his confiding amiability has landed him, and then comes the difficult question for the Court of Appeal to decide which is the truth, his confession or his retraction. While he is in police custody he rarely retracts, but when once in jail and out of the power of the investigating police he frequently does so.

This is the point to which the Sessions Judge of Umballa calls attention. He says: "I think it would be an excellent thing, and would add much to the value of confession if all magistrates were directed to see that prisoners brought up for confession were not again remanded to police custody, but sent direct to jail, *and to explain carefully before recording their statements that this will be done.* No precaution to remove police influence for the moment is of any avail if the prisoner knows that when the process of recording his statement is over he will once more be returned into the hands of the police." The italics are ours, and they explain the whole situation. If the prisoner knew he would immediately afterwards go back into police custody he would confess, for he would realise that he might be made to suffer unpleasantly for his contumacy. But if he considered himself secure from their direct power, he would probably recognise that he was safe from their machinations and leave them to prove their case against him if it was a true one. Mofussil magistrates ought certainly, with their opportunities of experience, to understand the Native character, and it is difficult to conceive how they come to believe that the ordinary Native can be expected to give a voluntary confession of guilt. If he is innocent he will naturally refuse to say he is guilty: that is the ordinary Native. But much more likely is he to protest his innocence if he is really guilty. And in the case of there being no evidence against him it almost approaches childishness to imagine that the Native will so give himself away as to make a voluntary confession. It is against his character to do so. The very conditions imposed by the criminal law on the acceptance by courts of confessions would show that the Government is fully aware of the unreliability of this form of evidence, for amongst other things it is laid down that no police officer shall offer any inducement or threat to any person to make confession of crime. The fact that the law considers it necessary to make such a provision in all seriousness speaks for itself. Other precautions have also been adopted to ensure the spontaneity and genuineness of confessions, as for instance, that the magistrate recording them should first of all satisfy himself by questioning the accused that the statements are made voluntarily, that he should record the circumstances under which they came to be made, that the police officer in whose custody the person has been brought up should not be present, and that he should not suggest to the magistrate the questions to be put to the intending confessor. The latter rules were of great importance and were brought into force by means of circulars of the Calcutta High Court, as the judges felt that the presence of the police officer tended to deprive the confessor of his freedom of thought and action. But the evil still remains that the prisoner knows he has to go back to police custody, and the fear of the consequences of his not following out the suggestions made to him to confess must always be present to the wretched man's mind. Thus the safeguards devised by the law or embodied in such rules as we have mentioned are nullified.

The suggestion of the District Judge of Umballa helps to meet the difficulty by providing that if a man professes his willingness to make a statement incriminating himself, he shall be previously informed that he shall be transferred from the keeping of the investigating police to the custody of the impartial jail. The Superintendent of the jail will have no interest in his being either reticent or in his confessing. To the investigating police, on the other hand, the man's acquittal or conviction means failure or success. We have only to remember that reports on police administration in India measure the good or bad work done by the percentage of convictions secured in cases sent up by the police for trial. It would be contrary to nature if the police were not eager to secure convictions when this means official commendation and promotion. When the conscientious native criminal, suffering from the pangs of his tender conscience, so common to the people, yields to the irresistible promptings of moral rectitude and comes forward voluntarily and admits his guilt, by all means let his confession condemn him. But we must welcome every practical suggestion that will limit those unseen but persuasive methods by which the police are wont to influence his morality. To this end the suggestion of the Sessions Judge of Umballa seems well worthy of attention.

Imperial Parliament.

Friday, June 2.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

REGULATIONS FOR CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATIONS.

East India (Examinations for the Civil Service)—Copy presented—of Regulations for Examinations for the Civil Service of India [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE.

Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had received any reply to the letter addressed by him on the 15th ultimo to the Secretary of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, regarding the long delay that had occurred in the submission of its Report; and, if so, would he state its contents to the House.

Lord G. Hamilton: I have received some personal replies from individual members of the Commission, but I am not yet in a position to give the general sense of the Commissioners. As regards the draft Report, I am informed that, of the three portions of which it is composed, two have already been circulated, or are in the act of being circulated for the approval of the Commission.

SUGAR EXPORTS AND IMPORTS.

Captain Sinclair asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he was now in a position to give the House the complete figures of the exports and imports of sugar from and into India for the year ending March 31, 1899, distinguishing raw sugar from refined.

Lord G. Hamilton: The exports of sugar from India in the year ending March 31, 1899 (including re-imported sugar), were as follows: raw, 289,668 cwts.; refined, 208,899 cwts. The imports for the same period were as follows: raw, 312,778 cwts.; refined, 3,764,910 cwts.

Captain Sinclair asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he could give particulars of the exports of refined sugar from India to Ceylon during the past few years:

And, whether the refined sugar so exported was Native-refined or a re-export of foreign-refined.

Lord G. Hamilton: On page 110 of the recent Countervailing Duties Blue-Book the hon. member will find two tables giving details of Indian sugar exports to Ceylon and other countries. The tables distinguish between refined and unrefined sugar.

All the sugar shown in the two tables 36 and 37 is *Indian* sugar. The re-exports of foreign refined sugar from India to Ceylon were small, and so were not shown separately in the Blue-book.

Monday, June 5.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE DUM-DUM BULLET.

Mr. Dillon asked the Secretary of State for India, who was responsible for the use of the Dum-Dum bullet by British troops in India.

Lord G. Hamilton: I stated, in reply to a question put to me by the hon. member in this House on March 24, 1898, that these bullets were issued by order of the Government of India, that no further sanction for their issue was necessary, and that no such sanction was either asked for or given; but that her Majesty's Government were fully informed as to the proceedings of the Government of India, and saw no reason for questioning their propriety. I may add that the reason for the issue of this bullet was that experience had shown that the bullet previously in use did not adequately protect the troops using it. As at present advised, I see no reason for modifying the opinion which I then expressed. But I may add that since last autumn the Government of India have had a new pattern of bullet under trial; and I was informed in reply to an enquiry about two months ago that those trials were not complete, but that they would be proceeded with and reported on as soon as possible.

Mr. Dillon: Will the right hon. gentleman kindly say whether he will be willing before the new pattern bullet is adopted to lay before the House the opinion of medical experts on the effects of that bullet on animals?

Lord G. Hamilton: There were experiments made in connexion with the old bullet and on the strength of these experiments this bullet was adopted.

Mr. Dillon: Yes, but the results of the experiments were never communicated to the House of Commons. This is a very large question. (Hear, hear.) When I pressed the right hon. gentleman before he refused me information on this point with regard to the Dum-Dum bullet. (Cries of "Order, order," and Opposition cheers.)

I am asking a very reasonable question. I wish to know whether the right hon. gentleman will undertake to communicate to the House the results of the experiments now being tried with the new bullet before that bullet is adopted for the Indian troops?

Lord G. HAMILTON: I do not recollect having refused to give the previous reports. If the hon. member wants the previous reports he can have them—I will lay them before the House.

Colonel MILWARD: May I be allowed to ask the right hon. gentleman a supplementary question of which I have given him private notice—whether the Dum-Dum bullet contains any explosive substance, or whether it is composed of a soft leaden nose and nickel base, instead of the nickel nose and the soft leaden base of the Lee-Metford bullet?

The SPEAKER: Order, order. The hon. member is entering into a debate on the merits of the subject. (Laughter and "hear, hear.")

Mr. DILLON asked the First Lord of the Treasury, whether a resolution prohibiting the use of the Dum-Dum bullet was passed at Commission No. 1 of the Peace Conference on June 1:

Whether this resolution was opposed by the British delegate:

And, whether he could undertake that the British delegates would be instructed not to oppose this resolution in the General Conference.

Mr. CHANNING asked the Under-Secretary of State for War, whether, in view of the decisive condemnation of the use of the Dum-Dum bullet by the Peace Conference at the Hague, her Majesty's Government would take into consideration the advisability of discontinuing the use of this bullet in wars with semi-civilised or savage people, as well as with those nations who were parties to the Conference.

Mr. BALFOUR: The members in conference have agreed that their proceedings shall be secret except in so far as communications are made with their consent to the representatives of the Press on the spot. Her Majesty's Government cannot under those circumstances make any statement as regards instructions to the British delegates. (Hear, hear.)

Tuesday, June 6.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

STATEMENT OF MORAL AND MATERIAL PROGRESS.

East India (Progress and Condition),—Copy presented,—of Statement exhibiting the Moral and Material Progress and Condition of India during the year 1897-8. Thirty-fourth Number [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

MEDALS AND CLASPS.

Mr. H. D. GREENE asked the Secretary of State for India whether medals and clasps for service in the last Punjab War and the Tirah Campaign, 1897-8, had been issued to officers and men of the Bengal Staff Corps entitled thereto; and, if not, what was the cause of the delay, and when the distribution would take place.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The medals and clasps granted for the operations on the Punjab Frontier in 1897-98 have been in course of distribution since last summer. Any delay which may have occurred is due to the medal rolls not having been promptly submitted.

Thursday, June 8.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

LEGAL EDUCATION IN BOMBAY.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he was aware that the control of legal education in Calcutta was wholly in private hands, the Government Presidency College having no law department, and the four private colleges teaching up to the full course of the University law degree:

And, whether he would state upon what grounds the Bombay Government had now decided to pursue a different policy, and considered it not advisable that the control of higher legal education in Bombay should be wholly or partially in private hands.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The facts are as stated in the first paragraph of the question.

The grounds on which the Bombay Government decided that the control of higher legal education should not in Bombay be allowed to pass to private institutions are thus stated in a letter from that Government of September 1, 1898: "In the opinion of this Government it is inadvisable to allow the control of higher legal education to pass to private institutions, for the administration of the law is undoubtedly a part of the general administration of the country, and in spite of the fundamental dissociation of law from politics, there is a distinct danger of the perversion of legal instruction to political uses."

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India whether for the last few years the Bombay Government had contributed nothing to the support of the Government Law School, but on the contrary had made a yearly profit of about Rs. 8,000 from the fees paid by the students, and had now resolved to raise those fees:

Whether he was aware that the Bombay Government refused to sanction the affiliation of the proposed private College of Law on the ground that they desired to improve the Government School by means of those enhanced fees, and were therefore unwilling that students should be diverted to another institution:

And, whether this prevention of the establishment of a private College of Law had been sanctioned by the Government.

Lord G. HAMILTON: It is a fact that the fees received at the Government Law School at Bombay have during recent years exceeded the expenditure, but I doubt whether the average excess has been so much as Rs. 8,000; in 1896-97 it was only Rs. 3,190. It is also true that the Bombay Government have resolved to raise the fees, but this is not to make a profit out of fees, but to make the new organisation self-supporting. I answered the second and third paragraphs of the question in my reply to the hon. member's question of May 16 last. The question of the fees had nothing to do with the refusal of the Bombay Government to sanction the application of the private institution to the Bombay University.

THE PASTEUR AGITATION.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary for India, whether his attention had been drawn to the proceedings of the Central Committee of the Pasteur Institute, held on April 15 last at the office of the Director General, Indian Medical Service, at Simla (the Director General himself in the chair), when it was proposed to ask the Government to make a grant for a Pasteur Institute, and to place it under a Government medical officer:

Whether this Committee had been formed with the sanction of Government:

And, whether it was proposed to grant them the assistance asked for.

Lord G. HAMILTON: (1) I have seen a newspaper report of the meeting of the Pasteur Institute Committee to which the question refers.

(2) The Government of India are, I believe, aware of the formation and proceedings of the Committee; but I ascertained some weeks ago that they had not decided on their course of action. They hoped, however, to deal with the subject during the present summer.

The following Notices of Motion appear on the Order Paper of the House of Commons:—

Sir HENRY FOWLER—Indian Tariff Act, 1899.—That an humble Address be presented to her Majesty, praying that her Majesty will be pleased to disallow The Indian Tariff Act, 1899.

As Amendments to Sir Henry Fowler's Motion—Indian Tariff Act, 1899:—

Mr. WYLIE: Line 1, leave out from "That," to the end of the Question, in order to add "in the interests of India and of Free Trade throughout the world, this House approves of the Indian Tariff Act, 1899."

Sir HOWARD VINCENT: Line 2, leave out "to disallow," and insert "having regard to the condition of affairs produced in her Majesty's loyal Colonies in the West Indies, to direct that legislation be as soon as practicable introduced into this House upon the model of." [An early day.]

THE RANGOON OUTRAGE.

INSANITY OF THE VICTIM.

INDIGNATION THROUGHOUT INDIA.

[BY CABLE, FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.]

CALCUTTA, June 8.

The outrage at Rangoon committed by a dozen or more British soldiers upon a respectable Burmese woman, who has since become insane, excites the deepest indignation throughout the country.—*By Indo-European Telegraph.*

AN INDIAN CONCERT.—Dr. Sarat K. Mullick and Munshi Kashi Prasada are to be congratulated on the brilliant success which attended their unique and interesting invitation entertainment, given last week in honour of the birthday of her Majesty the Queen-Empress of India. The spacious banqueting room of St. James's Hall, Regent Street, was crowded to overflowing, and many it is feared had to leave disappointed, unable to find even standing room. Among the distinguished people who accepted invitations were Sir Richard Temple, G.C.S.I., Sir William Lee Warner, Sir Gerald Fitzgerald, Sir James and Lady Rivett-Carnac, Sir Lepel Griffin, the Hon. Mr. Justice Ameer Ali (of Calcutta), the Attaché and Secretary to the Chinese Legation and Suite, Sir M. M. Bhownaggree, M.P., Mr. Schwann, M.P., and Mrs. Schwann, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, Sir Joshua and Lady Fitch, Sir J. and Lady Tyler, Lady Arnold, Sir Roland Wilson, Sir J. Jardine, the Countess d'Aulby, Countess Gwendoline de Mauin, Baroness Gudin, Baroness de Uordhua, the Hon. C. Setalvad, Lady Cook, Lady Clarke, Mr. Walter Crane, Mr. and Mrs. Caine, General and Mrs. Cooke, Miss Loië Fuller, the Hon. Misses Kennard, the Rev. Canon and Mrs. Floyd, the Rev. J. L. and Mrs. Cardwell, Mrs. Blomfield, and Major Brand. Among those who were unavoidably absent were Lord George Hamilton, M.P., Secretary of State for India, and Lady George Hamilton, the Lord Mayor and Lady Mayoress, the Earl of Northbrook, Lord Reay, the Countess of Aberdeen, Lord Kinnaird, and Lord Stanley of Alderley. The entertainment included an excellent miscellaneous concert, assisted in by Native and European artistes, and opened with an interesting selection of "Indian music" contributed by Miss Evelyn Stuart Hardy, Miss Mabel D. Hardy, and Mr. Zeauddin Balkhi; followed at a later interval by Denza's Neapolitan song, "Funiculi Funicula," sung with delightfully characteristic expression by Mr. A. Sarathkumar Ghose. The magnificent Indian tableaux which, three in number, occupied the places of honour on the programme were undoubtedly, however, the special features of the afternoon, and in their due succession the central and surpassing points of attraction. The first tableau represented an Indian durbar: nobles in gorgeously coloured draperies and blazing with jewels, presenting "nuzzur," a gift of precious metals brought by subjects to their rulers. The second, a scene of charming yet splendid simplicity, represented "The Princess Indumati choosing a Husband," taken from Raghuransa by the dramatist, Kalldasa, A.D. 3. The approach of the third and final tableau was appropriately heralded by the following quaint refrain from a "Loyal Indian Song," admirably sung by Mr. K. B. Dioatia: "With unbroken feelings of loyalty, O ye Aryas (Indians), bend before the lotus feet of the Queen." In this beautiful concluding tableau was represented, in a scene of combined dazzling Western and Oriental splendour "The Royal Proclamation of 1858," whereby it was pronounced that India had "passed from the control of the East India Company, to that of her most Gracious Majesty, Queen Victoria," the representation being witnessed by the large assemblage standing, and amid the strains of the National Anthem, in which both audience and performers enthusiastically joined.—*The Queen.*

Vol. I.—To Concentration of Army on Frontier.

SECOND AFGHAN WAR.

1878-79-80.

By Colonel H. B. HANNA,

Formerly in Punjab Frontier Force and late Commanding at Delhi, Author of "Indian Problems," etc.

PALL MALL GAZETTE.—"Colonel Hanna's tremendous care, completeness and clearness, with his intense conviction, make him a very powerful writer."

ATHENÆUM.—"The ability with which his case is presented is considerable and it is probable that in his main line his view is a well founded one."

MORNING LEADER.—"Colonel Hanna is peculiarly well fitted to handle the multiplicity of questions—political, military, and social—that arise in connection with the Second Afghan War."

A. CONSTABLE, 2, WHITEHALL GARDENS, LONDON.
Price, Net—10s.

ROMESH C. DUTT'S WORKS ON INDIA.

1. **MAHA BHARATA,** condensed into English verse (*Temple Classics Series*). Cloth, 1s. 6d.; Leather, 2s.
2. **The Same Work,** Illustrated Edition, with an Introduction by the Right Hon. Max Müller. Cloth, 12s. 6d.; Parchment, 15s.
   PUBLISHERS: DENT & Co., LONDON.
3. **ENGLAND AND INDIA:** 1785 TO 1885. Price 2s.
   PUBLISHERS: CHATTO & WINDUS, LONDON.
4. **LAYS OF ANCIENT INDIA,** Selections from Indian Poetry rendered into English verse. (*T. O. Series.*) Price 7s. 6d.
5. **CIVILIZATION IN ANCIENT INDIA,** 2 Vols. (*Trubner's Oriental Series.*) Price 21s.
   PUBLISHERS: KEGAN PAUL & Co., LONDON.
6. **CIVILIZATION IN ANCIENT INDIA,** People's Edition, complete in one volume. Price Rs. 5.
   PUBLISHERS: ELM PRESS, 29 BEADON STREET, CALCUTTA.

N.B.—The above Works can be obtained in India through any Indian bookseller.

"INDIA," 1898.

VOLS. IX. AND X.

NOW READY.

Bound in Cloth (post free) 7/6 each net cash.

To be obtained at the Offices,
84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

A limited number of Volumes V. (1894), VI. (1895), VII. (1896), VIII. (1897), can also be obtained. Price **8/6** each, post free. Remittances should accompany order.

NOW READY.

Price One Shilling and Sixpence, net. In India, 1 Rupee.

CONGRESS GREEN-BOOK: No. 2.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE.

EVIDENCE-IN-CHIEF OF THE FIVE INDIAN WITNESSES.

Large foolscap, 116 *pp.*

Published by the
BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

This Volume may be also obtained from the Secretaries of the Standing Congress Committees at Calcutta, Bombay, and Madras. Remittances should accompany application.

N.B.—The postage of each copy is 4d., in addition to the price stated above.

LONDON INDIAN SOCIETY.

DADABHAI NAOROJI, ESQ., PRESIDENT.

Above Society on receipt of 5 anna stamps will give information regarding course of study and cost of living in England. Gentlemen will be met at London, Edinburgh, Oxford, or Cambridge stations on giving fortnight's notice.

Apply, Dr. MULLICK,
SOHO SQUARE, NATIONAL HOSPITAL, LONDON, W.

DR. T. N. GHOSE'S

PECTORAL BALSAM.

A BOON TO SUFFERERS FROM ALL DISORDERS AND COMPLAINTS OF THE LUNGS AND CHEST.

For Cold in the Head, Coughs, Hoarseness, Asthma, Hooping Cough, Bronchitis, Sore Throat.

DR. W. VENOR says: "I have used it myself and prescribed it for many patients, and can very strongly recommend it for Bronchitis, Asthma, Indigestion. It will not cure Asthma or Indigestion, but a single dose I have found gives an immediate relief.—31st March, 1889.

P. C. GHOSE & CO., NEW MEDICAL HALL, MEERUT.

TRADE MARK. JVARA-HARI.

is what its name implies FEVER DESTROYER,

and Cures Malarious, Intermittent and Remittent types of Fevers. Colds, etc.

North Raglan Barracks, Devonport.
I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jvara-Hari." Both in India and Africa I have found it the BEST REMEDY FOR FEVER I know
C. E. WOOD, Capt. 22nd North Staffs. Regt.

"Jvara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for 4 dozen, per value payable parcel. I think there is more than magic in it.
G. L. NARSINGA ROW.

For INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.

Cuddalore Municipal Councillors' Office.—"I have much pleasure in stating that your "Omum-Carpoor" was found very useful for Cholera if taken in the early stage,
C. S. SRINIVASA, Chairman.

Omum-Carpoor TRADE MARK

Prices of "JVARA-HARI" and "OMUM-CARPOOR" 8 ans., Rs., 1/8 Rs., 2/12 Rs., and 11 Rs. per bottle. N.B.—1 doz. sent post free. To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors,

HENRY'S GREAT INDIAN REMEDIES COMPANY, 43, King William St., London, E.C., and 27, Second Line Beach, Madras.

NOTICE TO ADVERTISERS.

Applications for rates for Advertisements in "INDIA," should be made to

**THE MANAGER,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers,
Westminster, S.W.**

Advertisements should reach the Office not later than first post on Thursday in order to ensure insertion in the issue of the following day.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is nine shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the MANAGER *of INDIA, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W. In any communication regarding copies of INDIA circulated in India, it is requested that Subscribers be referred to both by name and by the number printed in each case upon the addressed wrapper.*

Cheques and Post Office Orders payable to W. DOUGLAS HALL.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from MR. ELLIOT STOCK, *Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.*

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2, Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.